

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/566,567	01/31/2006	Ralf Franzgrote	40149/01101	6155
30636 FAY KAPI I II	7590 10/15/2010 N & MARCIN, LLP	EXAMINER		
150 BROADV	VAY, SUITE 702		PIERY, MICHAEL T	
NEW YORK,	NY 10038		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1742	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/15/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)		
	10/566,567	FRANZGROTE, RALF		
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	MICHAEL T. PIERY	1791		

	MICHAEL T. PIERY	1791	l			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 07 September 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THI	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.				
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of th application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:						
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing						
b) A The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	on.			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date		36(a) and the appropriat	a avtangion foo			
have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR.1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any semed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR.1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	ension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee te action; or (2) as			
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w.	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the				
AMENDMENTS	and the time period det letter in ex-	51 11 -1 1.57 (u).				
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause			
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or 	ter form for appeal by materially rec	lucing or simplifying t	ne issues for			
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a of NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21 See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mnliant Amendment (PTOL-324)			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		inplication (TOL OL+).			
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the			
 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proving. 		be entered and an e	xplanation of			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appear and was not earlier presented. Se	and/or appellant faile e 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.			
The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)					
	/Monica A Huson/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1791				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that Schwaighofer does not explicitly teach a décor inlay because the substrate is used to mold decorative surfaces and "its idear from Jury 3 of Schwaighofer that another surface of should be formed on the remaining portion of the substrate." The examiner disagrees. Schwaighofer teaches forming an interior door panel (paragraph 0005). There is no suggestion in the reference of a second layer placed or the substrate. The assertion that another surface should be placed on the substrate due to the presence of a groove is not supported anywhere in the reference.

Applicant argues that the examiner fails to point out which aspect if any meets the recitation of "the edging is enclosed by the curing material." As discussed in the office action on page 3, figure 4, #7 of Duriez is clearly enclosed by curing material.

Applicant argues that Duriz cannot disclose a first region formed exclusively by a décor inlay and a second region formed by cast skin. The examiner has relied upon Schwalphofer to disclose the first region formed exclusively by a décor inlay and a second region formed by cast skin. Duriez is relied upon solely to teach endosing the edging.

Applicant argues that one would not combine Schwaighofer and Duriez because if the foam were allowed to enter the area behind 18 of the substrate then the foam would escape the molding die onto the portion of 14 that isn't in the mold. The examiner disagrees. By forming the top end of the mold cavity (the area near 46) to resemble the spahe of the right area of the cavity (the area near 7) of figure 4 of Duriez, the clamping action of the mold can be maintained while the foam encloses the edging.